REMARKS

As a preliminary, Applicant and Applicant's representative thank the Examiner for the personal interview which was held on September 11, 2008.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 11 are the only independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, 11-13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 6,655,133 to Mikami et al. ("Mikami").

Further, claims 4, 8-10, 14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mikami in view of US 6,488,725 to Vincent et al. ("Vincent"), claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mikami in view of US 6,023,928 to Peter-Hoblyn et al. ("Peter-Hoblyn"), and claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mikami in view of US 3,157,987 to Pouit ("Pouit").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. As discussed at the interview, Mikami at step 503 on Figs 29 and 31 discloses performing post injection operations to raise the catalyst temperature, and to repeat these post injections until a threshold temperature has been reached, but Mikami does not determine a maximum quantity of fuel to be injected in the post-injection, i.e., any "maximum quantity" of the post-injections in Mikami is simply a result of the regulation as a function of the temperature provided in Mikami, so that Mikami does not determine any maximum quantity of fuel such that post-injections are interrupted as soon as the quantity of fuel injected has reached the predetermined maximum quantity.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention as recited in present claims 1 and 11 provides

for:

- determining a maximum quantity of fuel to be injected in the post-injection operations during the period of returning to idling following the foot being raised on the accelerator, and on the basis of said temperature; and

- immediately interrupting the or each post-injection operation as soon as the quantity of fuel injected has reached the predetermined maximum quantity.

This feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught or suggested in the cited references. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

Further, with respect to the dependent claims, it is submitted that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the combined features of each of these claims. Therefore, each of these respective claims is not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 502759.

Respectfully submitted,

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,373

Nicolas E. Seckel
Patent Attorney
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-669-5169
Fax: 202-822-1257
Customer No.: 29980
NES/rep